

From: [Jessica Winter](#)
To: [Robert Dexter](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS](#)
Subject: Re: LWG Chemical Fate and Transport Model Summary of June 8th Conference Call with EPA
Date: 06/18/2010 01:03 PM

agree with Bob that it would be beneficial to have a written outline of plans for the uncertainty analysis.
and also agree that the sediment animations will help us to evaluate the importance of spatial variability.
I'm not sure about the core data- possibly there is other data that I'm not aware of, but I thought we had only a few (3?) cores mentioned in the RI that were analyzed for depth profiles of contaminants and for radioisotopes for dating.

Robert Dexter wrote:

> On the scale issue, I have assumed that the sediment animations would allow some perspective on the predicted changes within individual cells, which should supplement any other discrete analyses. I would like to see some agreement on what locations and COCs will be selected for the small scale demonstrations.

>
> It wasn't clear from LWG's response to Comment 12 what form the early description of the uncertainty analysis would take. As I read it, they are just planning on giving an oral explanation. Can we get some written summary or outline in the short term?
>

> One minor point, in the response to the first Comment 4, in the second sentence the text refers to areas of the river "where little or no trend might be expected." I believe saying "little or no change" would be more accurate, and even better would be to say that there are areas of the river where little or no change has been observed. In that regard, can't the core data be used to help determine the reality? It seems they would provide at least some testable bounding on the burial rates.
>

> Bob

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]

> Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 1:07 PM

> To: Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov

> Cc: Robert Dexter; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS

> Subject: Re: LWG Chemical Fate and Transport Model Summary of June 8th Conference Call with EPA

>
> I do not recall whether we specified what the smaller spatial scales would be. Our comment (clarification 7) mentions 1/2 mile reaches and near shore areas. The LWG is also non-specific in its response to clarification 4 but provide the example of 1 mile in their opening remarks.
>

> For bioaccumulation/fish consumption, I think that the 1 mile scale is adequate because that is consistent with smallest exposure areas we are looking. For receptors such as sculpin, we are looking a smaller spatial scales. However, the PRGs for sculpin are considerably higher than that of the bioaccumulatives. For example, the PCB PRG for sculpin is 270 ug/kg; we will not be relying on MNR to achieve this value on a point by point basis.
>

> Overall, one mile is probably adequate from a risk assessment perspective. In addition, if, based on the results of the model run, we want to see some smaller spatial scales, I believe there is the flexibility.
>

> Eric

> From: Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov

> To: "Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS" <Earl.Hayter@usace.army.mil>

> Cc: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Bob Dexter <bob@ridolfi.com>, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

> Date: 06/17/2010 12:22 PM

> Subject: Re: LWG Chemical Fate and Transport Model Summary of June 8th Conference Call with EPA

>
> Hi Eric and everyone,
> Sorry I am late on this-- just catching up on things after getting back from the gulf.
>

> I thought that on the phone when we talked presenting model results on smaller spatial scales we specified reaches that were 1/2 mile in length divided into nearshore vs channel, but their item 1 on page 1 says 1 mile reaches. Am I remembering incorrectly? What do you guys think? For the smallmouth bass, the food web model looks at concentrations that are an average of all the 1-mile reaches containing the sampling location, which ends up being a weighted average of the 2 mile area around the sample with points near the sample weighted higher, so assessing the model on a 1/2 mile scale might tell us more about what is going on. For sculpin, the FWM uses 1/10 mile spatial scales, so that seems to require us to assess model performance on scales smaller than 1 mile. For other

> species the FWM uses sitewide averages, so that's not an issue.
> Jessica
>
>
> This seems fine to me. One small point to mention. In LWG's summary of
> the
> conf call to comment number 6, they include the following sentence in
> their
> write-up: "EPA also
> acknowledged that a vertically averaged model is the most appropriate
> approach for modeling this system." I would have worded this as 'a
> vertically averaged model is an acceptable approach for modeling this
> system'. A 3D model, when computationally possible, would always be
> 'the
> most appropriate approach' since even unstratified water bodies have
> vertical
> gradients in velocity and transported constituents. Maybe this is just
> the
> modeling bias of a nerdy engineer surfacing. This is just a minor
> comment
> for your consideration, and you do not have to ask them to make this
> change
> if you are comfortable with their wording.
>
> Earl
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
> [<mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>]
> mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
> Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 5:09 PM
> To: Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS; Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov; Bob Dexter
> Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: Fw: LWG Chemical Fate and Transport Model Summary of June 8th
> Conference Call with EPA
>
>
> See the note and attachment below. Please let me know if the path
> forward is
> acceptable.
>
> Thanks, Eric
> ----- Forwarded by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US on 06/16/2010 02:07 PM
> -----
>
> From: "Jennifer Woronets" jworonets@anchorqea.com
> "jworonets@anchorqea.com
>
>
> To: Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Eric
> Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
>
>
> Cc: "Carl Stivers" cstivers@anchorqea.com, "Keith Pine"
> kpine@anchorqea.com, "Jennifer Woronets"
> jworonets@anchorqea.com, "Bob Wyatt" rjw@nwnatural.com, "David Ashton" david.ashton@portofportland.com
> <a class="moz-
> (b) (6)
>
> Betz" jbetz@ci.portland.or.us, "Jennifer Woronets"
> jworonets@anchorqea.com, jim.mckenna@verdantllc.com, karen.traeger@total.com, "Madalinski, Kelly" Kelly.Madalinski@portofportland.com, pdost@pearllegalgroup.com, "Rick Applegate" RICKA@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US, "Steve Parkinson" sparkinson@GroffMurphy.com, ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us
> ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us

> <mailto:audiehuber@ctuir.com>><mailto:audiehuber@ctuir.com>, Eric
> Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Bob
> Wyatt" <mailto:rjw@nwnatural.com>, "Colin Wagoner"
> <mailto:colin@ridolfi.com>, <a
> class="moz-txt-link-rfc2396E" href="mailto:cunninghame@gorge.net"><mailto:cunninghame@gorge.net>
> "><mailto:cunninghame@gorge.net>,"
> <mailto:erin.madden@gmail.com>, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "JD
> <mailto:jdww@jdww-law.net>, "Jennifer Peers"
> <mailto:jpeers@stratusconsulting.com>, "Jennifer Woronets"
> <mailto:jworonets@anchorenv.com>, <a
> class="moz-txt-link-rfc2396E" href="mailto:jim.mckenna@verdantllc.com"><mailto:jim.mckenna@verdantllc.com>, "Julie
> Weis" <mailto:jweis@hk-law.com>, "Keith Pine"
> <mailto:kpine@anchorenv.com>, Kristine
> Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
> <mailto:lisa.bluelake@grandronde.org>, "Madalinski, Kelly"
> <mailto:Kelly.Madalinski@portofportland.com>, <a
> class="moz-txt-link-rfc2396E" href="mailto:matt@jdww-law.net"><mailto:matt@jdww-law.net>,"
> <mailto:MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>,"
> "Michael Karnosh" <mailto:michael.karnosh@grandronde.org>, "Rick
> Applegate" <mailto:RICKA@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US>, "Robert
> Neely" <mailto:Robert.Neely@noaa.gov>, "Rose
> Longoria"
> <mailto:rose@yakama.com>, <mailto:tzeilman@qwestoffice.net>

Date: 06/16/2010 01:51 PM

Subject: LWG Chemical Fate and Transport Model Summary of June 8th
Conference Call with EPA

Chip and Eric -

> Please find attached the LWG's understanding of the path forward
> resolutions
> on each of EPA's comments on the chemical fate modeling. We are
> proceeding
> with preparing the additional information requests and calibrations as
> noted
> in the attached resolutions. We expect this process to culminate in an
> informal working meeting with EPA and Earl Hayter to go over these
> additional
> materials and results in approximately 4 weeks. At that time, we hope
> to
> gain EPA agreement to proceed with the modeling for the screening of
> alternatives. Please let us know right away if you have any
> disagreements
> with the stated resolutions, as this may impact the 4 week preparation
> timeline.

> Thank you,
> Jen Woronets J
> Anchor QEA, LLC
> <mailto:jworonets@anchoragea.com>
> 6650 SW Redwood Lane, Suite 333
> Portland, OR 97224
> 503-670-1108 Ext 24
> 503-670-1128 Fax

> ü Please consider the environment before printing this email.
> The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or
> entity
> named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that
> any

```
> disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this
> information
> is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in
> error,
> please notify us by electronic mail at <a
> class="moz-txt-link-abbreviated" href="mailto:jworonets@anchoragea.com
> ">jworonets@anchoragea.com</a> (See attached
> file: 2010-06-16 LWG-EPA fate model comment
> discussion.pdf)
>
> </pre>
> </blockquote>
> <br>
> <pre class="moz-signature" cols="72">--
> Jessica Winter
> NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
> 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
> Seattle, WA 98115
> Phone (206) 526-4540
> Fax (206) 526-6865
> <a class="moz-txt-link-abbreviated" href="mailto:jessica.winter@noaa.gov
> ">jessica.winter@noaa.gov</a></pre>
> </body>
> </html>
>
>
>
>
```

```
--
Jessica Winter
NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
Seattle, WA 98115
Phone (206) 526-4540
Fax (206) 526-6865
jessica.winter@noaa.gov
```